

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 1-27 have been rejected. Claims 1, 10, 17, and 25 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending.

During the telephonic interview, Examiner indicated the present amendments may require a further search. However, on reflection, and in view of the previous several searches, Applicants respectfully urge Examiner to reconsider the conclusion that yet another search is required. To facilitate Examiner's reconsideration, Applicants currently file the proposed amendment as an after final amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meggido, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,181; "MEGGIDO") in view of Muto, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0275270; "MUTO"). Applicants overcome these rejections in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

With respect to claim 1, it is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim. Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of MEGIDDO and MUTO does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection in that neither teaches nor suggests the following elements of amended claim 1 (emphasis added):

associating, *visually in part*, the list of information content segments with the first web page; and
displaying the list of previously appearing information content segments concurrently with the first web page and a representation of the second web page, *wherein ordering* of the list of information content segments

and relative display positions of each of the first web page, the information content segments, and the representation of the second web page are ***based in part on the chronological order*** of displaying the first web page, changing one of the information content segments, and displaying the second web page.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, MEGGIDO discloses a viewable cache of previously appearing content segments (Fig. 3b, col. 4 lines 16-20, 37-45), but is silent with regard to ordering according to a chronology of navigation events and associating, visually in part, the previously appearing information content segments with the first web page. Therefore, MEGGIDO cannot teach or suggest the above elements of claim 1.

Similarly, MUTO is silent with regard to ordering according to a chronology of navigation events and associating, visually in part, the previously appearing information content segments with the first web page. Thus, MUTO's cannot teach or suggest the above elements of claim 1.

Applicants would like to point out that silence is not a proper substitute for an adequate teaching or suggestion of facts from which a conclusion of obviousness may justifiably follow. Since MEGGIDO and MUTO, taken separately, are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the elements of claim 1 recited above, any combination of MEGGIDO and MUTO must necessarily be devoid of the required teaching or suggestion of the elements recited in claim 1. Consequently, the combination cannot make Applicants' claim 1 obvious and the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome.

Independent claims 10, 17, and 25 recite elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Thus, independent claims 10, 17, and 25 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Since claims 2-4 and 7-9, 11-16, 18-20 and 23-24, and 26-27 depend from claims 1, 10, 17, and 25, respectively, the rejections of these claims have been overcome for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with regard to claims 1, 10, 17, and 25.

Claims 5, 6, 21, and 22 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meggido, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,181; "MEGGIDO") in view of Muto, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0275270; "MUTO") in further view of Rice, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,486,891; "RICE"). Applicants overcome these rejections in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

As discussed above, any combination of MEGGIDO-MUTO is devoid of some teaching or suggestion of ordering according to a chronology of navigation events and associating, visually in part, the previously appearing information content segments with the first web page, elements of claim 1 incorporated by reference in claims 5 and 6. RICE is similarly silent with regard these elements. Consequently, any MEGGIDO-MUTO-RICE combination cannot make Applicants' claims 5 and 6 obvious.


Claims 21 and 22 incorporate similar elements by reference to claim 20 and are similarly non-obvious.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: September 15, 2006


Mark C. Van Ness
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778